

Vangsnes, V. (2025). Modelling teaching practices: A performative perspective.  
In M. A. Cabot, S. M. Høisæter & V. Vangsnes (Eds.), *Rehearsing for teaching: Theoretical and empirical approaches to a practice-based teacher education* (pp. 95–120). Fagbokforlaget. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55669/oa600503>

3

## **Modelling teaching practices: A performative perspective**

**Vigdis Vangsnes<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> Western Norway University of Applied Sciences

**Abstract:** This case study examines the use of modelling as a didactic approach for teaching about teaching. It focuses particularly on campus teachers using modelling to exemplify process drama methods, including teacher-in-role, in teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language. Lunenberg et al.'s (2007) four modelling types provide the framework for conceptualising these didactic situations, combined with performative theory, which states that content is both deliberately designed and staged. This highlights the importance of embodied, verbal, and spatial actions, which are central to the analysis. The findings indicate that by participating in the performative enactment of teaching, bodily and verbally, the preservice teachers were able to gain a broadened understanding of teaching beyond mere verbal reflection, suggesting that implicit performativity is as important as explicit talk in developing a teaching repertoire. This insight led to an adjustment of Lunenberg et al.'s model, introducing a new category: performative modelling, characterised by its aesthetic approach to teaching.

*Keywords:* modelling teaching, performative teaching practices, representation of practice, process drama, aesthetic approach to teaching

**Sammendrag:** Denne kasus-studien undersøker campuslærere som bruker modellering når de underviser om å undervise. Her modellerer de prosessdrama, inkludert lærer-i-rolle, i undervisning av engelsk som fremmedspråk. I analysen av materialet ble Lunenberg et al.'s (2007) fire modelleringstyper brukt som rammeverk for å konseptualisere de didaktisk modellerte situasjonene. Analysen bygger også på teori om performativitet, som indikerer at det didaktiske innholdet både er designet og iscenesatt. Dette betyr at kroppsliggjorte, verbale og romlige handlinger er sentrale og fungerer som analyseobjekter. Analysen viste at deltakelse i den implisitte performative undervisningen, kroppslig og verbalt, ga lærerstudentene en opplevelse som tillot en annen forståelse av undervisningen enn den verbale refleksjonen alene, og at implisitte performative handlinger er like viktig som eksplisitt samtale når en bygger et undervisningsrepertoar. Erkjennelsen av denne viktige distinksjonen førte til en rekonstruksjon av Lunenberg et al.'s modell som spesifiserer en konkret form for implisitt modellering: Performativ modellering. I denne studien kjennetegnes performativ modellering ved at den også omfatter en estetisk dimensjon i undervisningen.

*Nøkkelord:* modelleringsundervisning, performativt undervisningsdesign, representasjon av praksis, prosessdrama, estetisk tilnærming til undervisning

## Introduction

Recent studies on the ways in which preservice teachers (PSTs) learn to practise and build a teaching repertoire (Ball & Forzani, 2009; Forzani, 2014; Grossman, 2021; McDonald et al., 2013; Zeichner, 2012) have highlighted the need for more research on the strategies and methods for this process. Modelling and rehearsing specific aspects of teaching have been suggested as possible approaches.

One of the key objectives of modelling in teacher education is to make complex teaching practices visible so that PSTs can engage with, analyse, understand, and ultimately perform similar strategies themselves, which are integral to the discipline.

The study presented in this article is part of a project funded by the Norwegian Research Council called *Rehearsing Teaching Professionally in Teacher Education* (ReTPro, see Vangsnæs, 2021–2026), in which modelling teaching is the first of four phases in McDonald et al.'s (2013) 'cycle for collectively learning' (p. 382), presented in prologue 2 of this anthology. ReTPro focuses on English and Mathematics curricula, exploring the teaching methods of process drama (PD) and dialogic teaching (see part 2 of this anthology).

For this study, I observed the modelling phase on two occasions, during which campus teachers used modelling to exemplify PD, including teacher-in-role (TiR), in teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language (EFL/ESL).

To analyse these didactic situations, I employ Lunenberg et al.'s (2007) typology, which differentiates between implicit and explicit modelling. Implicit modelling is when teacher educators (TEs) 'walk the talk', demonstrating strategies and teaching methods through their actions, thus serving as role models for their PSTs. Explicit modelling includes any instance of meta-commentary, where TEs explain the choices they make while teaching and why, as illustrated in Table 3.1.

**Table 3.1***Modelling types (Lunenberg et al., 2007)*

Modelling types	Descriptions
Modelling type 1: Implicit modelling	Any instance where teacher educators 'walk the talk' and act as examples for their students.
Modelling type 2: Explicit modelling	Any instance of 'meta-commentary' or comments wherein educators make explicit the choices they make while teaching and explain why.
Modelling type 3: Explicit modelling and facilitating translation to the student teachers' own practices	Any instance wherein the educators connect modelled behaviour in the teacher education classroom to the prospective teachers' own practices
Modelling type 4: Connecting exemplary behaviour with theory	Any instance wherein the educators establish links between their practice and public or educational theory.

The model, however, does not mention which teaching strategies might be used as examples. Types 2, 3 and 4 in the typology focus on discussing the modelling process, thereby providing a 'meta-commentary' for the PSTs. *Talking* about modelling, more generally *oracy*, being a main expressive form in most teaching strategies, is an important aspect of learning to teach as well as a valuable medium for reflecting both in and on teaching (Schön, 2017; Leitch & Day, 2000). Nevertheless, teaching and reflection also involve other expressive forms of interaction between the educator and the student (see Biesta, 2010).

This study, therefore, examines instances where TEs model specific *aesthetic teaching strategies* as a didactic approach. It also discusses how TEs and PSTs work together to develop *teaching repertoires* (Holdhus et al., 2016) and *reflect in and on teaching* (Schön, 2017; Leitch & Day, 2000) while participating in the modelling process. Following the TEs as they implicitly model aesthetic teaching practices also involves using performativity as a theoretical and analytical lens.

The approximation of practising teaching (Grossman et al., 2009a; Grossman et al., 2009b) through PD here means that campus teachers act as teachers while the PSTs assume the roles of lower secondary school students. This is

understood as being part of a performative teaching approach, by which I mean to focus on *the act* of modelling – on what is done as well as what is said. In this study, it also implies that the teachers incorporate aesthetic approaches, emphasising collaborative creative teaching processes where role-taking is central.

Thus, performative teaching is seen as based in art, embodied, situated and material (Piazzoli & Schewe, 2023), as well as discursive and open to critique (Langellier & Peterson, 2004).

I observed Mark (English teacher) and Anna (drama teacher) while they were modelling with Mark's PSTs, who were preparing to become lower secondary English teachers. The topic for the modelling session was the civil rights movement in the United States during the 1950s. Mark and Anna alternated between being in and out of fictional roles – sometimes stepping out of fictional roles to just be the teachers who organise classroom activities, and sometimes stepping into roles, such as portraying Rosa Parks, a key figure in the civil rights movement. The PSTs also alternated between being in and out of a fictional role, while also being encouraged to consider how this way of teaching might be applied to their own future classroom teaching.

This study addresses the following research questions:

1. How do TEs reflect in and on modelling when using process drama, including teacher-in-role, as a teaching about teaching approach?
2. What characterises the PSTs perception of the modelling?

## Theoretical framework and existing research

### Modelling as representation of practice

While the extant research is limited, it suggests that TEs do not model as explicitly or as extensively as scholars recommend (Lunenberget al., 2007; Ritter, 2012; Ruys et al., 2013; Santagelo & Tomlinson, 2012).. Other scholars, such as Kennedy (2016), have expressed concerns about practice-based teacher education programmes that foreground specific teaching practices, potentially leading to an overly instrumental approach.

Several researchers (Bullock & Christou, 2009; Loughran & Berry, 2005; McGrew et al., 2018; White, 2011) argue that TE modelling must be explicit for preservice teacher learning to occur. By modelling explicitly, TEs can offer metacognitive insight into the work of teaching through several methods, such as thinking aloud, journaling, pre- and post-class discussions, and co-teaching (Loughran & Berry, 2005).

Building on this understanding of explicit modelling, some scholars discuss how TE modelling can be connected to PSTs' field experiences or educational theory (Lunenberg et al., 2007; Swennen et al., 2008). Connecting explicit modelling to PSTs' field experiences is important because, as Lunenberg et al. (2007) point out, 'teacher educators may discuss their pedagogical choices with their student teachers,... this does not necessarily mean that the students can make the translation to their own teaching' (p. 591).

Biesta (2010) asserts that education is an interaction between the activities of the educator and those of the learner. As such, education is situated in the interaction between the two, and it is the gap between teacher and PST that makes communication, and thus education, possible (Biesta, 2010, pp. 12–13).

Owing to this, an important part of the modelling phase involves TEs' unpacking and deconstructing of teaching strategies (Grossman et al., 2009a) together with the PSTs, with the purpose of reflecting in and on and discussing the educational choices through what can be described as a professional critique of practice.

Biesta also emphasises that teaching is purposeful action and might be thought of as an art. Thus, one objective in teacher education is to develop the pedagogic artistry of PSTs.

Grossman et al. (2009b) state that explicit representations of teaching are artefacts or illustrations of practice, including TEs' modelling of teaching practice. The representations can be used to expose PSTs to various examples of teaching or to help them notice specific aspects of teaching, with the aim of improving their content knowledge of teaching.

In recent years, many scholars have described and researched core practices of teaching in teacher education (Grossman, 2021). Grosser-Clarkson and Neel (2019) identified two distinct approaches that TEs use to prepare PSTs for core practices: a predesigned enactment approach and an open-designed approach. They explain that in a predesigned teaching approach, the TE provides a rehearsable classroom activity that addresses a set of core prac-

tices, whereas in the open-designed approach, the TE introduces specific core practices through various representations of practice without expecting PSTs to replicate a particular activity. In other words, the open-designed approach allows for a less constrained enactment (Grosser-Clarkson & Neel, 2019).

In line with Sawyer (2004), I think that open-designed approaches make it easier to promote PSTs' creativity, flexibility, and improvisational skills.

### **Performative teaching designs**

In this study, process drama (PD), including teacher-in-role (TiR), was employed as a design for learning (Selander, 2021), that is, a design for learning to teach on campus to facilitate the curriculum. PD is a teaching structure or methodology used to explore a theme, problem, situation, or idea using the artistic medium of unscripted drama (O'Neill, 1995; Vangsnes, 2021).

PD focuses on communicative and artistic processes, incorporating different perspectives through role-taking. TiR, as a method within process drama, is a teaching approach where the teacher assumes a role and improvises within a fictional framework to explore a topic alongside the students. The students can either participate in role or as themselves (Bolton, 1982).

The term 'performative' was first introduced by Austin (1975) in his concept of *how to do things with words*. The idea that speech is a form of action, and that the classroom is a space for communicative action, has since gained popularity (Schewe, 2020).

Another performative perspective can be traced to Sauter's (2000) description of art as a communicative *event* where 'both the presentation of actions and the reactions of the spectators, who are present at the very moment of the creation, are central' (p. 11). PD is an arts-based approach to teaching, viewing the process as an aesthetic event that incorporates role-taking and active participation. 'It means that the event can be an arena for the constant process of negotiating experiences and meanings that constitute culture' (Carlson, 2008, p. 6).

The term 'performative' has its roots in 'form' (*performance*) and 'formative' (*performative*), with the Latin prefix *per* meaning 'through' and 'by means of'. According to Piazzoli and Schewe (2023), the word implies education through form, with form understood as art, language, and the body. In this

sense, a ‘performative’ approach to teaching can be defined as an embodied approach, bypassing the dualism of mind and body.

Böhnisch (2010) suggests that the arts share a common notion of performativity that distinguishes it from a sign system, a text or a representation. They see performativity as concerned with action and doing rather than sign and being. In this study, ‘performative’ refers to teaching shaped by aesthetic means of action.

When emphasis is placed on the action or event aspect of teaching, various theories rooted in performativity, aesthetics and dramaturgy can be applied, viewing constructing meaning as a process that is social, bodily, verbal, affective, and cognitive. Bodily learning puts action in focus (Merlau-Ponty, 2010).

A dramaturgical perspective on teaching relates to *the narrative the teachers wish to convey* and how they shape and communicate this narrative to engage with their students (Deleuze, 1994; Szatkowski, 1989; Østern, 2014). PD, with its focus on role-taking, highlights the doubling of reality created by fictionality, meaning that the participants act both as themselves as well as examining the topic as if being someone else.

Drawing from Langellier and Peterson (2004), teaching is here understood as an embodied and situated activity, open to critique. Conclusively, the study explores the theoretical considerations of a performative approach and the practical applications for a performance-based pedagogy, intended as an opportunity to consider what it means to prepare PSTs to become reflective and critical performers of teaching.

## **Design and methods**

This is a qualitative case study used to explore a particular teaching situation in detail. My research on the pedagogical applications of process drama as a strategy for modelling in teacher education follows Haseman’s (2006) understanding of ‘practice-led research’, as it is both initiated in and carried out through practice.

I am also inspired by Seitz’ (2016) proposed theory of a new ‘performative research’ paradigm, which aims not ‘to capture reality in graphs or to test existing hypotheses, but to aspire to be one with practise, to activate tacit knowledge, and generate new insights while processing, dealing with, and handling practice’ (Bellezza, 2020, p. 307).

## Data collection

To answer the research questions, I collected data during two modelling phases. The data sources included classroom video observations of the modelling, field notes, and one video-stimulated recall interview with the TEs, as well as one with the PSTs.

In the interview with the TEs, we watched the video together and they were asked to describe the main purpose of their modelling, and the possibilities and challenges they faced when doing the actual modelling.

In the interview with the PSTs, we also watched the video of the modelling together. I examined whether their perspectives on what they experienced during the modelling itself and observed in the video aligned with the intentions and purposes of the TEs.

I used a nearly identical interview guide for both the TEs and PSTs, with a particular focus on how the PSTs viewed the TEs' reflections *in* and *on* practice. The PSTs were asked to focus on the enactment as it took place and analyse how the TEs taught and prepared them for teaching.

They were asked to describe the modelling as part of teacher education itself, to expand on how, what, and why they valued the modelling of the teaching activities and to explain how, if at all, their own teaching was influenced by the modelling.

## Data analysis

The videos from the observations and interviews were transcribed and analysed using HyperRESEARCH. These data formed the basis for developing sub-categories (see Table 3.2). During the analysis process, I used open coding as described by Corbin and Strauss (2008) within the constant comparative analysis method, writing codes or labels next to the transcriptions.

The results from the thematic content analysis of the modelling and interviews identified certain perspectives on modelling (Krippendorff, 2018). The enactment of modelling, and how it was described by the TEs and perceived by the PSTs, became the thematic unit examined through an interplay of theory and data. The main categories were further divided into sub-categories. This process involved defining and exemplifying central concepts through extracts from the data that resonated with the chosen theories on modelling and performativity.

Consequently, the study primarily examines modelling as forms of representations of practice (Mc Grew et al., 2018) and what might be termed the educational performance of teaching. The findings were categorised into: i) modelling as representation of practice; ii) modelling and translation to theory; iii) modelling as a trigger for rehearsing and facilitating transfer to one's own teaching. Given my theoretical focus on modelling as a purposeful aesthetic act, an additional sub-category was derived from the data, namely iv) modelling performative teaching. The codes and their explanations are presented in Table 3.2.

The main categories were derived from the research questions as well as from theory. In the following section, I will demonstrate how the sub-codes were developed and from which data sources they were derived.

**Table 3.2**

*Categories, explanation of codes, and data sources*

Research questions main category	Sub-category	Explaining the code	Dataset
How do TEs reflect in and on modelling as a teaching about teaching approach when using process drama in EFL?	Modelling as	The TEs demonstrate teaching by involving the PSTs as if being students.	Video observation
	Representation of practice (construct/form of the theme/lesson)	The TEs construct/deconstruct the theme/lesson into episodes. The TEs use direct/indirect forms of teaching. The TEs use predesigned vs open-designed approaches. The TEs are concerned with the risk of instrumentality (interview). The PSTs perceived this as variation, engagement, thinking, talking, acting.	Interview with TEs Interview with PSTs
What characterises the PSTs perception of the modelling?	Modelling as	The TEs guide/do not guide and focus on transfer to PSTs' own teaching, facilitating rehearsal. The PSTs perceived this as learning by doing.	Interview with TEs Interview with PSTs
	Transfer to own teaching		
	Modelling as	The TEs use/do not use meta-talk. The TEs theorise/do not theorise (e.g. The Art of Teaching).	Video observation
	Linking theory to practice	The TEs are concerned about spoiling the magic of the moment. The PSTs perceived this as embodied understanding.	Interview with TEs Interview with PSTs

Research questions main category	Sub-category	Explaining the code	Dataset
	Modelling	The TEs use performative and aesthetic investigation in teacher education didactics (improvisation).	Video observation
	Performative (and aesthetic) teaching practices	The TEs use fiction, in and out of role, body and mind.	Interview with TEs
		The TEs explain, challenge, perform, include, stimulate, and motivate the affective and the cognitive. The PSTs perceived this as varied, improvisational, and artistic.	Interview with PSTs

## Findings and discussion

As mentioned previously, the TEs aimed to exemplify performative teaching designs. In the following, I will summarise and discuss my findings in line with the model of Lunenberg et al. (2007).

### Modelling as representation of practice

The starting point of the analysis, and what was noticed first when observing the modelling, was that the TEs were enacting the teaching together with their PSTs *as if* the PSTs were students. This performative representation of practice – doing teaching together – transformed teaching into a communicative event (Sauter, 2000), a shared presence that can serve as an arena for the ongoing negotiation of experiences and meanings (Carlson, 2008).

The process of negotiating meaning was evident when the PSTs, in their roles as prosecutors and defenders in the trial against Rosa Parks, discussed and made arguments from both sides of the court hearing at length. Those who were assigned the role of prosecutors mentioned in the interview how challenging it had been for them to adopt and argue for a perspective that was far from their own beliefs (interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023).

In the enactment of teaching itself, the TEs represented practice by intertwining predesigned and open-designed approaches to teaching, demonstrating a shift from predesigned and scripted methods to more improvisational

and open-designed ones. Process drama and TiR have some predesigned characteristics and predefined framings. For instance, the topic and the episodic structure involving role-taking and TiR were predesigned. However, they were also open-designed, meaning there was no scripted plan. What happened within the framings relied heavily on the here and now, and on how the TEs and PSTs collaboratively explored the chosen topic, demonstrating their reflections during the learning–teaching experience.

Nevertheless, the TEs remained in charge and had the authority to decide and frame the next episodes. This presents, somehow, a dilemma for TEs. When asked in the interview to describe the main purpose of using modelling in teacher education, one of the TEs described it as showing the PSTs a toolbox – not meant for replication, but for providing and exemplifying teaching ideas.

*I do not want my teaching to be monologic; I see my modelling as suggestions and want the PSTs/students to be critical and participate in an open-designed and improvisational teaching structure...*

(Interview with TE, 02.12.2022)

The same TE expressed a desire to stimulate the PSTs' professional judgement. He was therefore sceptical of the term 'modelling' because he felt it connotes teaching as instrumental and risks being too predesigned. However, he also acknowledged that, in many ways, he was modelling every time he was in class with his PSTs. This perspective aligns with Lunenberg et al. (2007), who refer to this as implicit modelling, where the TEs 'walk the talk' and act as examples while teaching.

Both TEs explained that the main reason for modelling was to create an opportunity for PSTs to participate in performance-based teaching, thus making the modelling a trigger for the PSTs' subsequent rehearsals. In the end, one of the TEs suggested the term 'participatory modelling' to avoid any misunderstanding of the concept. The PSTs reflected on the modelling, saying:

*We experienced how varied a lesson might be structured and that we could teach the same topic from many different angles. By taking physical part in the simulated lesson on the floor, we learned how to involve and engage students, both in ways of thinking, talking and acting. (Interview with PSTs, 7.2.2023)*

They also commented on specific parts:

*The different parts of the lesson were linked together, but in the beginning, we did not understand how COVID and not being allowed to enter the bus if we were not vaccinated had anything to do with the topic for the lesson.* (Interview with PSTs, 7.2.2023)

COVID refers to the TEs starting the modelling in an indirect manner, where, in the role of a bus driver, one of the TEs invited the PSTs onto a bus, telling those with only one vaccine dose to sit at the back. The quote shows that the PSTs were indirectly considering the composition and decomposition of the modelling.

Later, they discussed whether this indirect approach was an effective teaching strategy or if it was too removed from the original theme – the civil rights movement. The shift between present and past opened up opportunities for linking current topics to historical themes, with the intention, as explained by the campus teachers, of making the theme more relevant to the daily life of the PSTs. This is explored further in the section on modelling as linking theory to practice.

The PSTs emphasised that the PD modelling provided rich opportunities to practise and develop the four skills in EFL – reading, speaking, writing and listening – and that they were inspired to facilitate similar drama activities in their own teaching.

However, both the TEs and the PSTs acknowledged that this form of practice representation is time-consuming, and they expressed doubts about the feasibility of frequently implementing process drama in this way.

In conclusion, both the video observations and the interviews show that the modelling served as a representation of practice with purposes that aligned, albeit with slightly different perspectives in the data. The video observations showed reflection in practice and how a combination of pre-designed and open-designed approaches was enacted.

In the interviews, the TEs explained that the purpose of modelling was to use it as a toolbox – not for replication, but to stimulate the PSTs' own professional judgement and to encourage participation in performance-based teaching. The interviews with the PSTs revealed that they perceived the mod-

elling as demonstrating a variety of teaching methods, illustrating that a topic can be taught from many different angles.

### **Modelling as linking theory to practice**

In the first year (2021), the TEs did not make their teaching choices explicit, nor were these choices translated much to the PSTs' own practice or connected to theory. Instead, the TEs explained in the interview that they chose to address this after the PD. Not explicitly talking about and explaining their teaching seemed to be a dilemma for the TEs, which was also indirectly noted by the PSTs in the focus group interview.

The PSTs referred to TiR as a 'play' rather than a teaching and learning strategy, indicating that the TEs had not explicated their approach.

The following year (2022), the TEs adjusted their strategy. Although they still did not explain or link their methods to theory during the modelling phase, they explained that they did it more thoroughly afterwards. When this was discussed in the video-stimulated interview, one of the TEs explained:

*If we were to stop in the middle of the teacher-in-role to deconstruct, it would have spoiled the magic of the teaching... Teaching using the process drama method, and especially teacher-in-role, opens up a magical space because it brings teaching to life, motivating and highlighting critical incidents that involve emotions and engagement. (Interview with TEs, 02.12.22).*

However, it is clear that the TEs did facilitate and link theory to practice to some extent. For instance, as observed at the end of the process drama, there was a significant discussion between the TEs and the PSTs about whether the indirect framing of the topic was a good teaching strategy. This was also problematised by the PSTs in the subsequent interview, where they discussed whether the disconnect between the two themes was too great to make the link meaningful.

When the PSTs who were not vaccinated had to move to the back of the bus, they retrospectively described this as giving them an uncomfortable feeling of being less valuable. However, they did not consider disobeying the bus driver's order. When asked why, one PST explained, 'I felt that he (the

bus driver) was in charge and that he had the power to decide over the bus' (interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023). As a result, they did not protest. This experience facilitated an important discussion about power relations, as well as the significance and responsibility of involving emotions in educational situations.

The bus episode also serves as an example that can illustrate the difference between a core practice and a teaching activity. The teaching activity can be categorised as *teacher-in-role*, containing certain characteristics such as the teacher being in role and the students either being themselves (as in this case) or in role. A core practice might be identified as *involving emotions in teaching* because it demonstrates what teachers do while they are in the midst of teaching and is used because it is believed to have the potential to improve student achievement (Grossman, 2021).

Dorothy Heathcote developed a frame for TiR, known as 'We are in the brotherhood of all those who...' (Wagner, 1976, p. 48), to convey the idea of pretending to be in companionship with all who are in similar situations. This provides a wider angle of approach to the situations which an action seeks to address. From my point of view it is through these emotional responses that students can begin to understand the differences and similarities between the people they explore in the drama and themselves. Their emotional reactions can provide insights into situations they would not have understood without acting them out.

Incorporating the COVID-topic into the process drama contributed to raising the PSTs' affective level because they were themselves, and not in role, and so could not hide behind a role distanced from their own identities. Although it remained a fictional framing, a contract was established beforehand between the TEs and the PSTs, stating that they were exploring the dual theme within a fictional frame. The COVID-topic became a performative agent that produced feelings, discussion and ethical considerations, and was intended as a strategy to start the lesson with a current topic that affected them all.

The findings of this study align with those in the literature. For example, the TEs did not extensively link their teaching to educational theory or research. However, they mentioned that they addressed this in the lessons that followed.

Interestingly, in the interviews, the PSTs expressed themselves in ways that demonstrated a deep understanding of what they had participated in.

It is noteworthy that the PSTs understood the connection to theory, even though the TEs did not explicitly pause to include meta-commentaries. As one PST stated:

*I really understood how important it is to teach topics like this in ways that open up possibilities for the student to become completely involved, both emotionally and cognitively. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

This suggests that the PSTs perceived the modelling as a demonstration of the art of teaching, recognising that teaching can come in various forms. Indirectly, it also indicates that they became aware of the importance of dialogic teaching.

Another PST went on to say:

*Of course, it is important to plan our teaching and have a proper framing of the theme, but the modelling showed us that teaching also involves improvisation and the ability to listen to the students and take their perspective. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

It appears that the PSTs were able to reflect on and make the connection to relevant theories about teaching, even though the TEs did not explicitly connect the modelling to theory or to the prospective teachers' own practices. There may be different explanations for this, such as the TEs making more of these connections in subsequent lessons.

However, it can also be attributed to the PSTs' direct, bodily, and physical participation in the modelling. By engaging in performative teaching, where teaching is understood as an explorative and creative process, they were able to experience teaching from multiple angles. Although the PSTs did not explicitly mention it, the video recordings of the teaching events show that they experienced teaching in a bodily, relational, creative, affective, and cognitive manner simultaneously. This experience appears to have prompted reflections in and on education that might have been difficult to grasp through discussions or reading alone.

### **Modelling as transfer to own teaching**

The TEs did not want their PSTs to simply copy their modelling, but instead aimed to provide them with various routines or structures of teaching as a toolbox to choose from. They were also aware that the teaching experience on campus might be challenging to translate into new contexts. Nevertheless, the TEs focused on transferring these experiences to the PSTs' own teaching by involving them in the process drama. This was expressed as follows:

*The campus teachers modelled a teaching process which made us take part as if we were students. In a way, we learned teaching by doing teaching – they (the TEs) took on roles, and we became students while simultaneously learning different teaching methods. It became meta-like. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

The transfer occurred indirectly through the assignment given to the PSTs, which encouraged them to create their own teaching plan inspired by the modelling. Following ReTPro's learning-to-teach cycle (McDonald et al., 2013), the PSTs were guided through the subsequent phases of the cycle, beginning with the rehearsal phase on campus and followed by the enactment in practice.

In the interview (07.02.2023), the PSTs explained that they were supposed to first create, then rehearse on campus, and finally enact their own teaching plan, which included a short version of a PD incorporating TiR. Although they did not engage in teaching themselves during the modelling phase, they participated in the TEs' teaching as if they were students. They were then expected to develop and rehearse their own teaching during the next phase of the cycle.

*...they (the TEs) showed us so many interesting ways we could engage students in a topic, and so it was hard to make our own plan... we really needed to rehearse on campus... the TEs guided us to some extent, but it would have been even better if the practicum teachers had come to campus to help us rehearse and prepare. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

This is an interesting perspective that needs to be further developed in teacher education.

The PSTs also described the transference to their classrooms, emphasising the actions they had undertaken with their students. Their focus on actions suggests an awareness of the performance aspect of teaching, even though they did not specifically describe teaching as performance.

In the interview, when discussing process drama, they mentioned how they framed the chosen topic, which fictional role they had chosen for themselves, whether their students were invited into fictional roles, and how they managed to involve their students both emotionally and cognitively.

*We wanted to involve the students and create an atmosphere where they felt compelled to participate... I felt that the teacher-in-role was, in a way, an initiating episode that inspired further participation in the discussion that followed.* (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)

This indicates their awareness and focus on collaborative, artistic, and spatially creative teaching, even though the TEs did not explicitly link their actions to relevant educational theory. The way they described their actions in the interview shows an understanding of the physical, symbolic, and reflective characteristics of those actions.

The PSTs emphasised that they had previously participated in similar teaching when they attended junior college, but only as students. The new experience was participating simultaneously as students and as future teachers.

In the interview, they reflected on how this dual perspective made them evaluate the experience in a different way, now seeing it as a possible teaching strategy. They also discussed the challenges and opportunities when teaching in practicum:

*Sometimes we used words in English that were too difficult, and the students did not understand; we struggled to find simpler expressions.* (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)

In summary, modelling as transfer to one's own practice can be seen as a trigger for rehearsing on campus to construct an individual teaching repertoire.

## Modelling performative teaching practices

In this case, Selander and Kress' (2010, pp. 20–21) concept design *for learning* means creating *designs for learning teaching* that include performative elements, as they aim for implicit modelling to occur in a performative form.

The TEs planned and conducted the process drama about Rosa Parks, dividing it into episodes that were interconnected despite shifting in time and space. This approach is known as montage-inspired dramaturgy (Szatkowski, 1989), where different layers of meaning are layered on top of each other within an episodic structure.

The video observation shows the TEs reflecting *in* teaching as they linked all the layers or episodes together into a cohesive unit, while ensuring that each episode made sense on its own. The benefit of choosing such a closely linked structure is the sense of coherence it provides for the participants. This coherence was also noted by the PSTs:

*... it (the teaching) had many parts, but they belonged together; all the parts were about segregation in the US at that time – it was engaging.* (Interview with PSTs 07.02.2023)

Performative actions carried out in a montage-dramaturgy have no fixed start or end; the different episodes can change order, and the pauses between episodes allow for personal associations and interpretations. The modelling had a predesigned framing, as the topic and teaching structures were decided in advance. However, there was room for improvisation within each episode. This means that the modelling moved along a continuum between predesigned and open-designed approaches.

When analysing teaching from a performative perspective, the focus is on the action or event, examining the physical and bodily enactment of teaching (Merleau-Ponty, 2010). The TEs deliberately employed performative and aesthetic teaching strategies because they wanted their PSTs to experience new teaching methods they believed the PSTs were unfamiliar with (interview with TEs, 02.12.2022).

The video observation revealed how the TEs reflected *in* teaching as they used strategies that engaged the PSTs' bodies (the space was constantly shifting, and the participants moved from scene to scene), verbal language (the PSTs argued in the court hearing and discussed the benefits of direct vs

indirect teaching approaches), collaboration (two groups, where each had to prepare and act as either prosecutors or defenders), exploration (the topic was explored from different perspectives in each episode) and creativity (while the topic was decided, each episode allowed for improvisation and creative shaping of artistic form). This suggests that the TEs aimed to involve their PSTs in an aesthetic learning-to-teach process.

However, when it came to shaping aesthetic forms, this aspect was less developed. The TEs could have provided the PSTs with tasks such as, ‘Can you, in groups, create a depiction showing Rosa’s family the day they heard about the dramatic bus ride?’ Tasks like this would encourage working in a form- and arts-based manner within the actual topic.

Despite the aforementioned, within a fictional framing (where they explored roles as if they were citizens of the US at that time), the participants explored a historical topic, pretending to be someone else, across time and space. This was observed by the researcher and mentioned by the PSTs in the interviews.

When asked about the teaching perspectives demonstrated by the modelling, one PST reflected:

*... the methods showed us how we can make our students talk, read, write, listen, and argue in English. We became emotionally engaged in the topic, for instance, when we suddenly heard Martin Luther King’s speech over the classroom monitor. We could not have learned how to teach this way without experiencing it ourselves, physically on the floor. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

Another PST specifically reflected on the importance of the multimodal impulses and media that functioned performatively and were incorporated into the modelling:

*The song (‘Blackbird’ by Beatles), the TV-recording of Rosa Parks, and the written material contributed to curiosity and excitement – I felt motivated when these new impulses were introduced. (Interview with PSTs, 07.02.2023)*

## Conclusion

### **Modelling a performative didactic design: Body and mind in action**

When the term ‘performative’ is placed before ‘didactic design’ (Selander & Kress, 2010), the focus is turned from social semiotics and signs towards actions and events. Movement, thinking, oracy, affects and emotions are understood as parallel activities which engage the whole human being when they participate in embodied and kinaesthetic performative teaching and learning activities.

In this study, both the TEs and PSTs emphasise the importance of embodied and affective experiences, both in the enactment itself and through their reflections in and on teaching. The concept of performativity can be viewed as a practice theory suitable for planning, performing and analysing teaching, where TEs and PSTs collaboratively engage in purposeful teaching strategies that involve emotions and creativity, highlighting that implicit performativity is as vital as explicit talk.

Recognising this distinction led to a revision of Lunenberg et al.’s model, specifying a concrete form of implicit modelling: Performative Modelling. *Implicit performative modelling* may be employed when TEs wish to emphasise the communicative and interactional aspects of teaching, including both embodied and verbal communicative acts. In this study, the term ‘performative’ also includes aesthetic actions at work.

*Implicit performative modelling* can be described as any instance where TEs model teaching by acting, living through and reflecting in and on performative aesthetic teaching forms alongside their PSTs. These forms include embodied, verbal, material and improvisational dialogic encounters, aimed at stimulating the whole person – both affectively and cognitively.

For modelling to be meaningful as a design for *teaching about teaching*, this study suggests that implicit performative modelling can highlight and illuminate performative aspects of teaching that are often overlooked in teaching analysis. The intertwining of body and mind is evident in the video observations and in the way the informants described their experiences during the interviews.

In line with Østern et al. (2019) and Piazzoli et al. (2023), I suggest referring to this approach to teaching about teaching as ‘performative didactic design’. I define performative didactics as teaching strategies where teachers

use aesthetic and form-creating methods, challenging the bodies and minds of students to be participatory, creative, explorative, relational and thoughtful.

In conclusion, the study reveals that combining implicit with explicit modelling provides opportunities to explore, rehearse, deconstruct, and theorise about teaching.

However, it was particularly emphasised by the PSTs that participating in the common performative modelling phase facilitated translation to their own practice just as much as the deconstruction and the discussion did. Engaging in the implicit enactment of teaching, both physically and bodily, offered the PSTs an understanding of teaching that verbal reflection alone could not provide.

I therefore argue that offering PSTs access to not only explicit discussions but also the performative aspects of teaching fosters both metacognitive thinking and the involvement of emotions and creativity. Participation in these practices can support PSTs in constructing their purposeful teaching repertoires.

Both the TEs and PSTs stress that combining implicit performative modelling with explicit meta-commentaries helped expand their teaching repertoires.

## References

- Austin, J. L. (1975). *How to do things with words*. Harvard university press.
- Ball, L. D. & Forzani, F. M. (2009). The work of teaching and the challenge for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60(5), 497–511.
- Bellezza, A. (2020). Developing performative competence and teacher artistry: A pedagogical imperative in the multicultural classroom. *L2 Journal*, 12(3).
- Biesta, G. J. (2010). Why ‘what works’ still won’t work: From evidence-based education to value-based education. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29, 491–503.
- Bolton, G. M. (1982). Drama as learning, as art and as aesthetic experience. In *The development of aesthetic experience* (pp. 137–147). Pergamon.
- Bullock, S. M. & Christou, T. (2009). Exploring the radical middle between theory and practice: A collaborative self-study of beginning teacher educators. *Studying Teacher Education*, 5(1), 75–88.
- Böhnisch, S. (2010). *Feedbacksøyer i teater for svært unge tilskuere. Et bidrag til en performativ teori og analyse [Feedback loops in theatre for very young audiences. A contribution to performative theory and analysis]* [Doktorgradsavhandling – doctoral dissertation, Aarhus Universitet].
- Carlson, M. (2008). Perspectives on performance: Germany and America. In E. Fisher-Lichte (Ed.). *The transformative power of performance. A new aesthetics*. Routledge
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (2008). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Sage.
- Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Columbia University Press.
- Forzani, F. M. (2014). Understanding ‘core practices’ and ‘practice-based’ teacher education: Learning from the past. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 65(4), 357–368.
- Grosser-Clarkson, D. & Neel, M. A. (2020). Contrast, commonality, and a call for clarity: A review of the use of core practices in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 71(4), 464–476.
- Grossman, P. (Ed.). (2021). *Teaching core practices in teacher education*. Harvard Education Press.
- Grossman, P., Compton, C., Igra, D., Ronfeldt, M., Shahan, E. & Williamson, P. (2009a). Teaching practice: A cross-professional perspective. *Teachers College Record*, 111(9), 2055–2100.
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K. & McDonald, M. (2009b). Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15(2), 273–289.
- Haseman, B. (2006). A manifesto for performative research. *Media International Australia*, 118(1), 98–106.
- Holdhus, K., Høisæter, S., Mæland, K., Vangsnes, V., Engelsen, K. S., Espeland, M. & Espeland, Å. (2016). Improvisation in teaching and education – roots and applications. *Cogent Education*, 3(1), 1204142.
- Kennedy, M. M. (2016). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945–980.
- Krippendorff, K. (2018). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Sage publications.

- Langellier, K. & Peterson, E. (2004). *Storytelling in daily life: Performing narrative*. Temple University Press.
- Leitch, R. & Day, C. (2000). Action research and reflective practice: Towards a holistic view. *Educational Action Research*, 8(1), 179–193.
- Loughran, J. & Berry, A. (2005). Modelling by teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21(2), 193–203.
- Lunenberg, M., Korthagen, F. & Swennen, A. (2007). The teacher educator as a role model. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 23(5), 586–601.
- McDonald, M., Kazemi, E. & Kavanagh, S. S. (2013). Core practices and pedagogies of teacher education: A call for a common language and collective activity. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 64(5), 378–386.
- McGrew, S., Alston, C. L. & Fogo, B. (2018). Modelling as an example of representation. *Teaching Core Practices in Teacher Education*, 35–55.
- Merleau-Ponty, M. (2010). *Phenomenology of perception* (D. Landes, Trans.; 1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203720714>
- O'Neill, C. (1995) *Drama worlds: A framework for process drama (the dimensions of drama)*. Heinemann Drama.
- Piazzoli, E., & Schewe, M. (2023). Arts education in Ireland: Visions of a performative teaching, learning and research culture. *Journal de Recherche en Éductions Artistiques (JREA)*, (1), 72–83.
- Ritter, J. K. (2012). Modelling powerful social studies: Bridging theory and practice with preservice elementary teachers. *The Social Studies*, 103(3), 117–124.
- Ruys, I., Defruyt, S., Rots, I. & Aelterman, A. (2013). Differentiated instruction in teacher education: A case study of congruent teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*, 19(1), 93–107.
- Santangelo, T. & Tomlinson, C. A. (2012). Teacher educators' perceptions and use of differentiated instruction practices: An exploratory investigation. *Action in Teacher Education*, 34(4), 309–327.
- Sauter, W. (2000). *The theatrical event: Dynamics of performance and perception*. University of Iowa Press.
- Sawyer, R. K. (2004). Creative teaching: Collaborative discussion as disciplined improvisation. *Educational Researcher*, 33(2), 12–20.
- Schewe, M. (2020). Performative in a nutshell. *Scenario: A Journal of Performative Teaching, Learning, Research*, 14(1), 109–117. <https://doi.org/10.33178/scenario.14.1.7>
- Schön, D. A. (2017). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315237473>
- Seitz, H. (2016). Performative research. In S. Even & M. Schewe (Eds.), *Performative teaching, learning, research* (pp. 301–321). Schibri Verlag.
- Selander, S. (2021). A design-theoretic and multimodal approach to language teaching and learning. In S. Diamantopoulou, & S. Ørevik (Eds.), *Multimodality in English Language Learning* (pp. 16–26). Routledge.
- Selander, S. & Kress, G. (2010). *Design för lärande – ett multimodalt perspektiv* [Design for learning – a multimodal perspective]. Nordstedts.
- Swennen, A., Lunenberg, M. & Korthagen, F. (2008). Preach what you teach! Teacher educators and congruent teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*, 14(5–6), 531–542.

- Szatkowski, J. (1989). Dramaturgiske modeller. Om dramaturgisk tekstanalyse [Dramaturgic models. About dramaturgic text analysis]. In E. E. Christoffersen, T. Kjølner & J. Szatkowski (Eds.), *Dramaturgisk analyse: En antologi [Dramaturgic analysis: An anthology]* (pp. 9–92). University of Aarhus.
- Vangsnes, V. (2021). Prosessdrama som estetisk læreprosess: Ein strategi for utforskande iscenesetjing av sentrale verdiområde i Fagfornyinga [Process drama as an aesthetic learning process: A strategy for explorative staging of central values in curriculum renewal]. *Acta Didactica Norden*, 15(2).
- Vangsnes, V. (2021–2026). *Rehearsing teaching professionally (ReTPro): Building purposeful teaching repertoires to bridge theory and practice in teacher education* (Research project). Western Norway University of Applied Sciences. <https://prosjektbanken.forskningsradet.no/project/FORISS/320243>
- Wagner, B. J. (1976). *Dorothy Heathcote: Drama as a learning medium*. Heinemann.
- White, E. (2011). Working towards explicit modelling: experiences of a new teacher educator. *Professional Development in Education*, 37(4), 483–497.
- Zeichner, K. (2012). The turn once again toward practice-based teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 63(5), 376–382.
- Østern, A. L. (Ed.). (2014). *Dramaturgi i didaktisk kontekst [Dramaturgy in a didactic context]*. Fagbokforlaget.
- Østern, A. L. & Knudsen, K. N. (Eds.). (2019). *Performative approaches in arts education: Artful teaching, learning and research*. Routledge.